

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 372

CS 212 661

AUTHOR Compton, Joe; Smith, Carl, Comp.
TITLE Collaborative and Cooperative Learning Techniques.
Learning Package No. 6.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. School of Education.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 35p.; For other learning packages in this series, see
CS 212 656-705.
AVAILABLE FROM Learning Packages, ERIC/RCS, Indiana University,
Smith Research Center, Suite 150, 2805 E. 10th St.,
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698 (\$14.00).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For
Teacher) (052) -- Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Environment; *Cooperative Learning;
Distance Education; Elementary Secondary Education;
Inservice Teacher Education; Language Arts; Learning
Strategies; Peer Teaching; Reading Instruction;
*Small Group Instruction; Teaching Methods; Writing
Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Collaborative Learning

ABSTRACT

Originally developed for the Department of Defense Schools (DoDDS) system, this learning package on collaborative and cooperative learning techniques is designed for teachers who wish to upgrade or expand their teaching skills on their own. The package includes a comprehensive search of the ERIC database; a lecture giving an overview on the topic; the full text of several papers on the topic; copies of any existing ERIC/RCS publications on the topic; a set of guidelines for completing a goal statement, a reaction paper, and an application project; and an evaluation form. (RS)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ERIC/RCS
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

Learning Package #6

**Collaborative and
Cooperative
Learning Techniques**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dr. Carl Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

OVERVIEW

ERIC/RCS Learning Packages contain just what the practitioner needs for staff development workshops. Workshops can begin with an overview lecture , continue through readings and discussion material, and end with research projects and an annotated bibliography for further research.

Each learning package contains (1) a topic overview: a four-to-six page stage-setter; (2) in most cases, a digest of research: an ERIC summary of research on the topic written by a specialist; (3) a goal statement and a survey form; and (4) an extensive annotated bibliography of ERIC references.

Graduate-level university credit is available. For further information contact Indiana University School of Continuing Studies, Owen Hall #204, Bloomington, Indiana 47405. Enrollment in each course will be limited.

COLLABORATIVE AND COOPERATIVE LEARNING TECHNIQUES

(All references are fully documented
in enclosed bibliography)

by Joe Compton

Lecture

Cooperation and collaboration are useful approaches to coordinating group work. Professionals in many fields should consider using them whenever they are directing the activities of groups of people, whether children or adults. The purpose of these approaches is to improve learning by combining the efforts of peers rather than implementing individual assignments. Some people are better social learners than individual learners. A primary purpose of getting students together in social learning groups is to promote growth for all team members through interaction. According to Robert Slavin (1987), "certain forms of cooperative learning are considerably more effective than traditional methods in increasing basic achievement outcomes, including performance on standardized tests of mathematics, reading, and language."

In language arts classrooms, there frequently is too much emphasis on recitation and drill. Children learn as adults do, by exchanging ideas and cooperating. Why then separate the student from the experience of interacting with other students? Slavin (1987) argues:

"...when students are working together toward a common goal, academic work becomes an activity valued by peers. ...This is important for several reasons. First, students are often able to translate the teacher's language into "kid language" for one another. ...Second, students who explain to one another learn by doing so. ...Third, students can provide individual attention and assistance to one another."

Many educators believe cooperation and collaboration are synonymous, but this really is not the case. Cooperation is a term that probably makes most of us think of working together on something. "Cooperation" is made up of parts which mean, "to operate together" or "to work together." Almost any time a person or group works with another person or group, we have cooperation. Cooperation may be active or passive. Cooperation is characterized by two essential properties. First, there must be at least two parties interacting. Second, neither party can actively oppose the efforts of the other.

In contrast, collaboration implies the parties involved share responsibility and authority for basic decision making (Hord, 1985):

Two children are working on a writing assignment. They began the assignment together, and discussed what they wanted to write about. They worked together on the text. They jointly edited the paper and passed it to another group for editing. When they finish the essay it will be very difficult to identify who contributed particular parts of the essay since there was collaborative effort.

Concerning the relationship between collaboration and cooperation, Hord (1985) says, "Collaboration is not possible

without cooperation, but the inverse is not true. Collaboration requires a great deal more effort, but ideally yields more."

Both collaboration and cooperation have their places in education. Educators should avoid the error of thinking that cooperative work is not as important as collaborative enterprise. There will be instances, however, when one is more valuable than the other, depending on the goals desired. Students are an important variable in this equation. Many educators believe the curriculum and the teachers are solely responsible for deciding what children do in school. Children need to learn responsibility. The only way they can learn responsibility is to be given responsibility. This isn't to suggest that teachers give students the run of the classroom, but rather that teachers work towards empowering students.

As an example, imagine a class that needs to be motivated. What would happen if you began class by telling your students that they were going to form groups, set some goals for their learning, and work together to implement those goals? The students might choose to produce a play, working together on the writing, the production, and the performance of a jointly-written script. As the teacher, your goal would be for your students to see that learning is something in which they can take an active part.

Essential to this example is the concept of the team. Robert Slavin (1987), in his paper on cooperative learning, states that:

"Team members are responsible for one another's learning as well as their own. Students encourage and help each other master skills and content that you present. And in this cooperative setting, they convey to one another that learning is important, valuable, and fun."

Later in the same article, Slavin gives definitions, examples, and applications of such techniques as Student Team Learning methods, Student Teams Achievement Divisions, Teams-Games-Tournaments, and Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition. You may wish to use some of these approaches in your application exercise.

In his article Cooperative Learning and the Cooperative School (1987), Slavin provides a strong rationale for having students work in small, mixed-ability groups. As Slavin notes, "[t]here is now substantial evidence that students working together in small cooperative groups can master material presented by the teacher better than can students working on their own" (p. 7).

Another benefit of collaborative learning is that group processes promotes creativity. Even resistant children can benefit from collaboration. For an example of how this can work, look at Esther Sokolov Fine's article, Marbles Lost, Marbles Found: Collaborative Production of Text. It includes a short "novel" written by her students in a "behavioral class" for grades 4-6.

Cooperative and collaborative learning are proven concepts that educators should seriously evaluate for use in their classrooms. To help you implement these concepts, there are a variety of articles in the bibliography that provide perspectives on both collaboration and cooperation. These articles can assist you in your efforts to continue developing your understanding of how students learn in groups.

May 1989

DIGEST

Encouraging Revision

Teaching Writing with Peer Response Groups

by Andrea W. Herrmann

Teachers have turned their classrooms into communities of learners, as the focus of writing pedagogy shifts from written products to writing as a process, and as ways of making knowledge—including writing—are viewed from a collaborative or social perspective (Bruffee, 1983; Faigley, 1985). Writing instruction in our classrooms reflects a growing appreciation of the value of talk. By implementing peer writing groups, teachers encourage students to give, seek, and react to oral feedback among themselves as they write, in addition to reacting to the teacher's traditional comments on finished papers. This trend raises the interesting question of what effect peer feedback has on students' revision practices.

Respected teachers and writing theorists have fostered peer groups in high school and college classrooms as a way to encourage students to write and revise. Elbow (1973) promoted the use of "teacherless writing groups"; Murray (1982) recommended that teachers train students to respond constructively to writing in process; Macrorie (1984) discussed the value of creating a "helping circle"; Moffett (1983) suggested that teachers teach students to teach each other; and Bruffee (1983) maintained that getting students "to talk through" the task of writing is a form of collaborative learning that is essential. Using peer response groups, even with young writers, brings positive benefits, according to the descriptive classroom studies conducted by Graves (1983; 1984) and Calkins (1982; 1983).

Peer reactions often help young writers

Hence, writing groups, whose activity is sometimes referred to as "peer conferencing" or "peer collaboration," have become a pedagogical tool in a wide-range of teaching/learning contexts. It should be noted that teachers sometimes have peer groups respond in writing to written drafts from their fellow students. (See, for example, Wauters, 1988.) But more commonly, collaboration provides writers with an opportunity to read their drafts aloud and to discuss them face-to-face with a peer audience *while* the written product is taking shape. Classroom talk can be a positive aspect in supporting all phases of the writing process (Reid, 1983). Small groups can help apprehensive or blocked writers become more fluent and can provide an audience that assists the writer in revising (Legge, 1980).

Cooperative writing workshops help students discover audience, according to one study of college freshmen (Glassner, 1983). An ethnographic study concerned with talk in a high school classroom community examined whether writers' intuitions and revision strategies, among other things, could be "strengthened within a supportive classroom environment." (Kantor, 1984, p. 75). The study concluded that the development of a peer community fostered growth from egocentrism to audience awareness, and that knowing the audience helped students become more aware of possible strategies for revising.

Ziv (1983) found a pattern in the way the interaction in peer writing groups develops. Early in the semester, students' comments were primarily positive, but included some criticisms of content and form. The writers, however, did not always revise according to the reactions of their peers, and sometimes resented the criticisms. Later in the semester, however, advice from peers was more likely to be heeded because the students offered each other more concrete suggestions for revision.

Some studies indicate mixed effects

Not all the studies of peer reaction show unqualified positive effects on revision, however. Some studies suggest negative consequences as well. Gere and Stevens (1985) looked at a fifth-grade writing class to determine if the oral responses provided by groups to individual writers shaped their subsequent revisions. The study found both positive and negative results. Student writers were challenged by their peers "to clarify, to provide more detail" (p. 95) as the peer reactors asked questions when they were confused, and suggested ways to improve the writing. Some student writers integrated their peers' suggestions into subsequent revisions. Yet there were incidents of unproductive, even hostile, verbal exchange, and in some groups students hurried through the group work in a "robotlike monotone."

A case study of four children with low, average, and high abilities in writing (Russell, 1985) examined the relationship between peer conferencing and revision. The results indicated that in revising, poor writers were dependent on the questions of other students, whereas average and good writers tended to become their own audience and revise on their own.

Another case study conducted with college freshmen (Berkenkotter, 1983, 1984) sought to find out how students interact in their writing groups and whether writers improve their texts as a result of the interactions. The research revealed that the students' attitudes toward assistance from their peers varied considerably, as did the writers' approaches toward revision. One student, Stan, was too immature to heed his audience. Another student, Joann, became vulnerable to unwarranted criticism because she was so sensitive to her peer audience. Although a third student, Pat, felt responsible to his audience, he felt a greater obligation to his emerging text and revised independently of peer suggestions. The study concluded that students writing for an audience of peers do not necessarily benefit from their peers' suggestions.

Peer reaction seems to work in computer-assisted instruction

Preliminary evidence suggests that the nature of peer collaboration and feedback in classrooms where computers are

Dr. Andrea W. Herrmann is Graduate Coordinator and on the faculty at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

used to teach writing differs from that in regular writing classrooms. Under certain conditions, computers as writing tools appear to promote a collaborative environment, both in learning to write and in learning to use the technology (Daiute, 1986; Dickinson, 1986; Herrmann, 1985a, 1985b, 1986; Hocking and Visniesky, 1983; Selfe and Wahlstrom, 1985; Sudol, 1985).

In a classroom of first and second grade children, the computer created a whole new social organization that affected the way the children interacted (Dickinson, 1986). An ethnographic study that described a high school classroom (Herrmann 1985b, 1986) found a similar result. A variety of types of peer collaborations developed, having various kinds of influence on writing and revision; but not all students learned to collaborate successfully. The success the students had in revising their work appeared to depend, in part, on their ability to form effective collaborative relationships.

The literature suggests that the effects of peer comments on revision is not a simple cause and effect matter, but rather a complex one, dependent upon the interrelationship of multiple factors within the evolving social environment of particular classrooms and groups of students. While some of the students studied appeared to benefit from the comments of their peers, not all students in all classrooms did. Some students were unable, unwilling, or even ill-advised to follow peer reactions in revising what they had written. While there may be no one-to-one relationship between peer comments and revision, these studies, particularly the qualitative ones, suggest a range of real and potential benefits for students participating in an effective community of responsive peers.

References

- Berkenkotter, Carol. "Student writers and their audiences: Case studies of the revising decisions of three college freshmen." Paper presented at the 16th Annual Meeting of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, 1983. 14 pp. [ED 236 618]
- Berkenkotter, Carol. "Student writers and their sense of authority over texts," *College Composition and Communication*, 35, (3) 1984, pp. 312-319.
- Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Writing and reading as collaborative or social acts." In *The Writer's Mind: Writing as a Mode of Thinking*, pp. 159-169. Janice N. Hays, et al. (Eds.) Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1983. 261 pp. [ED 233 366]
- Calkins, Lucy McCormick. "A study of children's rewriting." Final Report for NCTE Research Foundation project No. 80:11, 1982. 405 pp. [ED 229 750]
- Calkins, Lucy McCormick. *Lessons from a Child: On the Teaching and Learning of Writing*. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1983. [ED 263 614; not available from EDRS]
- Daiute, Colette. "Do 1 and 1 make 2? Patterns of influence by collaborative authors," *Written Communication*, 3, (3) 1986, pp. 382-408.
- Dickinson, David K. "Cooperation, collaboration, and a computer: Integrating a computer into a first-second grade writing program," *Research in the Teaching of English*, 20, (4) 1986, pp. 357-378.
- Elbow, Peter. *Writing without Teachers*. New York: Oxford, 1973.
- Faigley, Lester. "Nonacademic writing: The social perspective." In *Writing in Nonacademic Settings*, pp. 231-340. Less Odell and Dixie Goswami (Eds.) New York: Guilford Press, 1985.
- Gere, Anne Ruggles, and Stevens, Ralph S. "The language of writing groups: How oral response shapes revision." In *The Acquisition of Written Language: Response and Revision*, Sara Warshawer Freedman (Ed.), pp. 85-105. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1985. [ED 265 553; not available from EDRS]
- Glassner, Benjamin M. "Discovering audience/inventing purpose: A case study of revision in a cooperative writing workshop." Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1983. 9 pp. [ED 227 513]
- Graves, Donald H. *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work*. Exeter, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1983.
- Graves, Donald H. *A Researcher Learns to Write: Selected Articles and Monographs*. Exeter, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1984.
- Herrmann, Andrea W. "Collaboration in a high school computers and writing class: An ethnographic study." Paper presented at the 36th Annual Meeting of the College Composition and Communication Conference, 1985a. 19 pp. [ED 258 256]
- Herrmann, Andrea W. "Using the computer as a writing tool: Ethnography of a high school writing class," Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1985b. [Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1986, No. 86-02, 051]
- Herrmann, Andrea W. "An ethnographic study of a high school writing class using computers: Marginal, technically proficient, and productive learners." In *Writing at Century's End: Essays on Computer-Assisted Composition*, pp. 79-91. Lisa Gerrard (Ed.) New York: Random House, 1986.
- Hocking, Joan, and Visniesky, Cheryl. "Incorporating the microcomputer into the traditional English classroom." Paper presented at the 18th Annual Meeting of the Northeast Regional Conference on English in the Two-Year College, 1983. 14 pp. [ED 240 612]
- Kantor, Kenneth J. "Classroom contexts and the development of writing intuitions: An ethnographic case study." In *New Directions in Composition Research*, pp. 72-94. New York: Guilford, 1984. [ED 250 682]
- Legge, Anne L. "Small groups in college writing classes: Why and how," 1980. [ED 204 803]
- Macrorie, Ken. *Writing to be Read*. Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook, 1984.
- Moffett, James. *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1983.
- Murray, Donald. *Learning by Teaching: Selected Articles on Writing and Teaching*. Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook, 1982. [ED 230 962; not available from EDRS]
- Reid, Louann. "Talking: The neglected part of the writing process." Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Meeting of the Conference, 1983. 10 pp. [ED 229 762]
- Russell, Connie. "Peer conferencing and writing revision: A study of the relationship." Service Bulletin No. 48, Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English, 1985. 25 pp. [ED 260 392]
- Selfe, Cynthia L., and Wahlstrom, Billie J. "An emerging rhetoric of collaboration: Computers and the composing process." Paper presented at the 73rd Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1985. 19 pp. [ED 261 384]
- Sudol, Ronald A. "Applied word processing: Notes on authority, responsibility, and revision in a workshop model," *College Composition and Communication*, 36, (3) 1985, pp. 331-335.
- Wauters, Joan K. "Non-confrontational critiquing pairs: An alternative to verbal peer response groups," *Writing Instructor*, 7, (3-4) 1988, pp. 156-165.
- Ziv, Nina D. "Peer groups in the composition classroom: A case study." Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1983. 11 pp. [ED 229 799]

ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills

Indiana University
2805 East Tenth Street, Suite 150
Bloomington, IN 47408
(812) 855-5847

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. R188062001. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Task #1

Goal Statement

Your Name: _____

Course #: _____

Learning package: _____

The purpose of writing a goal statement is to create an expectation for yourself, to establish a purpose that you can check when you have finished reviewing the package of materials. It should be used in conjunction with your reaction statement--the commentary that you will make after working your way through the materials in the learning package.

Directions: This is a pre-reading activity. Think about the topic of this package and then look at the various materials, primarily reviewing their headlines and subheads. What does that review prompt you to want to discover through this package?

Write a goal statement of no more than one paragraph that includes the questions that you want answered or the kinds of applications that you hope the package will help you accomplish in your work. Attached please find examples of representative goal statements submitted by former students.

Mail a copy of your goal statement to your instructor. Please keep a copy for yourself because your reaction statement should be based partly on the goal statement.

My Goal Statement for this Package

Please mail a copy of this form to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Examples of Goal Statements

It is my expectation that this learning package will direct me in new directions so that I may improve my instruction in the area of vocabulary. I would like to know when it is best to introduce new vocabulary words. I would also like to gain information about new methods one might use when introducing new vocabulary. I expect to read about some of the newest research related to vocabulary instruction. It is also expected that tested methods will be described and examined. I would hope that these articles would help me improve how I teach so that my students will benefit and become better readers.

Following the study of this package, I expect to increase my understanding of computer usage in reading development, learn how to integrate computers into reading and writing instruction for learning impaired students, and make decisions on the usefulness of computer games in the classroom.

Following completion of this package I intend to:

- 1) Identify the components of a formal reading program evaluation.
- 2) Analyze the characteristics of an effective reading program.
- 3) Develop evaluation strategies that will improve the monitoring of my program objectives.

Task #2

Reaction Statement

You are asked to type a four-page reaction to this learning package as a way of firming up your sense of what you find interesting, important, or beneficial in this group of materials. You should construct this reaction with your previously established goal statement in mind.

Given below are a number of prompts to indicate the kinds of questions that you might wish to answer in developing this reaction. You may use other questions than those that are here listed. We anticipate that your reaction will be approximately four typewritten, double-spaced pages. Please use the following format in heading your paper.

Reaction

Your Name: _____

Course #: _____

Learning Package: _____

Reaction Prompts

1. Were your goals realized, and how do you know? (Refer to your goal statement.)
2. What important or beneficial ideas did you find in these materials? (Please cite the articles.)
3. Are there trends or concerns in the materials that bother you? Are there those that you agree with? Discuss. (Please use the annotated bibliography and cite ideas from it.)
4. What ideas did you want to try in your daily work world? Describe how you could apply these ideas?

Application Project

If you decide to use this topic for one of your two application projects, you may want to spend more time thinking about ways that you could explore one or more of these ideas in your work.

When you have finished your statement, please mail it to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

Task #3

Application Project

As you select your two application projects, use the following guidelines:

1. **Formulate a question** that you would like to answer regarding this topic. (For example, can my slow readers use some of the self-monitoring strategies discussed in these materials?) A question often helps to clarify the kinds of information that you will collect or the kinds of evidence that you will use to convince a reader that you are pursuing an interesting question.
2. **Describe with as much detail** as is needed for a reader to understand what you did, what materials you used, what major procedures you used, what evidence you were looking for, in order to answer your question.
3. **Gather evidence** from your students or from teachers to show samples of the kinds of work or the kinds of interactions that were taking place. These samples may be your written observations, sample student papers, photographs, activity sheets, book titles, statistical data, or any other kind of evidence that demonstrates the reality of your inquiry.
4. **Write a summary** of your plan and of your conclusions. The summary should be coherent and clear so a person who was not on site can understand what you attempted and can appreciate the conclusions that you drew.
5. **Send a report** that includes a summary of your plan, sample evidence of what you found, a brief analysis of the evidence, and the conclusions that you
6. **Provide a cover page** that gives your name, address, course number, topic of learning package, and topic of your project. We will mail you a critique of your work. Send your report to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

Course Number _____

Date _____

Package Title _____

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. This package will help me do my job better.					
2. The pace of the package was too fast.					
3. The package's directions were confusing.					
4. It was easy to follow the directions given in the package.					
5. The package was too easy.					
6. The package was too long.					
7. The package should include more articles and documents to read.					
8. I didn't know the meaning of many words used in the package.					
9. The lecture explicated the topic of the package.					
10. The package's objectives were clear from the start.					
11. The package's teaching points were clear.					

What did you like best about the package?

What did you like least about the package?

How would you improve the package?

Please list other topics you would be interested in studying through our program.

Name (optional)_____

Position_____

Years Taught_____

Please mail a copy of this form to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

COLLABORATIVE AND COOPERATIVE LEARNING TECHNIQUES

ERIC/RCS

Selected Abstracts from the ERIC Database



**ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading & Communication Skills
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
(812) 855-5847**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sample ERIC Abstract

AN ED289160
 AU Binkley,-Marilyn-R.; And-Others
 TI Becoming a Nation of Readers: What Parents Can Do.
 CS Heath (D.C.) and Co., Lexington, Mass.; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
 PY 1988
 AV What Parents Can Do, Consumer Information Center, Pueblo, CO 81009 (\$1.50).
 NT 40 p.; For Becoming a Nation of Readers: The Report of the Commission on Reading, see ED 253 865.
 PR EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DE Beginning-Reading; Literacy-Education; Parent-Attitudes; Parent-Child-Relationship; Preschool-Children; Primary-Education; Reading-Aloud-to-Others; Reading-Attitudes; Recreational-Reading; Written-Language
 ID *Literacy-; *Parent-Influence; *Parent-Participation; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Processes
 ID Reading-Motivation
 AB Intended for parents and based on the premise that parents are their children's first and most important teachers, this booklet is a distillation of findings from the 1984 report of the Commission on Reading, "Becoming a Nation of Readers." The introduction reiterates the Commission's conclusions (1) that a parent is a child's first tutor in unraveling the puzzle of written language; (2) that parents should read to preschool children and informally teach them about reading and writing; and (3) that parents should support school-aged children's continued growth as readers. Chapter 1 defines reading as the process of constructing meaning from written texts, a complex skill requiring the coordination of a number of interrelated sources of information. Chapter 2, on the preschool years, focuses on talking to the young child, reading aloud to the preschooler, and teaching children about written language. The third chapter, on beginning reading, counsels parents on what to look for in good beginning reading programs in schools, and how to help the child with reading at home. The fourth chapter, on developing readers and making reading an integral part of learning, offers suggestions for helping the child succeed in school and for encouraging reading for fun. The afterword calls on teachers, publishers, and school personnel, as well as parents, to participate actively in creating a literate society. The booklet concludes with a list of organizations that provide practical help or publications for parents.

Interpretation of ERIC Abstract Field Identifiers

AN ERIC accession number (Use this number when ordering microfiche and paper copies.)
 AU Author(s)
 TI Title
 CS Corporate source
 PY Actual or approximate publication date
 AV Source and price (availability)
 NT Pagination and additional information (such as legibility or related documents)
 PR Indicates availability of document from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service
 DE Descriptors-indexing terms from the *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors* which indicate important concepts in the document
 ID Identifiers-indexing terms not included in the *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors*
 AB Summary

AN: EJ293110
 AU: Baumann,-James-F.
 TI: How to Expand a Basal Reader Program.
 PY: 1984
 JN: Reading-Teacher; v37 n7 p604-07 Mar 1984
 AV: UMI
 DE: Beginning-Reading; Primary-Education; Program-Improvement;
 Teacher-Role
 DE: *Basal-Reading; *Individualized-Reading;
 *Language-Experience-Approach; *Parent-Role; *Peer-Teaching;
 *Reading-Instruction
 AB: Suggests that, by adding LEA, individualized reading, and
 varied language arts activities to the basic reading program,
 teachers, helped by parent aids and peer tutors, can enliven
 reading instruction. (FL)

AN: EJ381784
 AU: Bergk,-Marion
 TI: Fostering Interpersonal Forms of Reading.
 PY: 1988
 JN: Reading-Teacher; v42 n3 p210-18 Dec 1988
 AV: UMI
 DE: Foreign-Countries; Interpersonal-Relationship;
 Piagetian-Theory; Reading-Instruction
 DE: *Beginning-Reading; *Cooperative-Learning; *Models-;
 *Reading-Processes
 AB: Emphasizes, with reference to Piaget, the importance of
 cooperative learning. Presents a text model describing the four
 aspects/participants of literal communication, and asserts that
 children confront a text from all aspects simultaneously.
 Describes three examples of interpersonal reading and writing
 activities observed in Austrian classrooms. (MM)

AN: EJ271063
 AU: Bohning,-Gerry
 TI: A Resource Guide for Planning, Implementing and Evaluating
 Peer and Cross-Age Tutoring.
 PY: 1982
 JN: Reading-Improvement; v19 n4 p274-78 Win 1982
 AV: Reprint: UMI
 DE: Elementary-Secondary-Education; Program-Development;
 Program-Evaluation; Teaching-Guides
 DE: *Cross-Age-Teaching; *Peer-Teaching; *Reading-Instruction;
 *Tutorial-Programs; *Tutoring-
 AB: Provides resources for teachers who wish to establish
 programs of peer or cross-age tutoring. (FL)

AN: ED270738
 AU: Brown,-Ann-L.; Palincsar,-Annemarie-S.

TI: Guided, Cooperative Learning and Individual Knowledge Acquisition. Technical Report No. 372.
 CS: Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.; Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for the Study of Reading.
 PY: 1986
 NT: 116 p.
 PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
 DE: Content-Area-Reading; Educational-Philosophy; Grade-1; Group-Activities; Learning-Theories; Listening-Skills; Peer-Groups; Primary-Education; Reading-Comprehension; Reading-Research; Teacher-Role
 DE: *Learning-Processes; *Learning-Strategies; *Peer-Teaching; *Reading-Instruction; *Teaching-Methods
 AB: Drawing upon Piagetian and Vygotskian developmental theories, philosophical examinations of the nature of argument and explanation, analyses of classroom and Socratic dialogues, and cooperative classroom structures, this paper examines how cooperative learning can influence individual knowledge acquisition. The paper first reviews some of the theoretical claims concerning a variety of group learning procedures and the evidence that supports their efficacy. Claims discussed include the following: (1) group participation aids learning, (2) group settings force learning with understanding and thus produce conceptual changes, and (3) individual thought processes originate in social interaction. The paper then examines a program of guided cooperative learning--reciprocal teaching, which combines expert scaffolding, guided practice in applying simple concrete strategies, and cooperative learning discussions. In particular, the paper explores the impact of the program on the listening and reading comprehension strategies of first grade students. The paper concludes that reciprocal teaching is a successful method of improving both listening and comprehension, and discusses possible extensions of the techniques to instruction in specific content areas. Fourteen pages of references are also included. (FL)

AN: ED266426
 AU: Cohen,-Suzette-F.
 TI: Comprehension Monitoring Strategies for Whole Text.
 PY: 1985
 NT: 12 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the College Reading Association (29th, Pittsburgh, PA, October 24-26, 1985).
 PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DE: Questioning-Techniques; Reading-Strategies; Secondary-Education
 DE: *Metacognition-; *Peer-Teaching; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Improvement; *Teaching-Methods
 AB: Unskilled readers can become skilled readers and learners of whole text, if they are given instruction in effective strategies and taught to monitor and check their comprehension while reading. Two strategies for comprehension monitoring are

self-questioning and reciprocal teaching. Questions students can ask before reading concern the concepts introduced and how the material was organized. Questions students can ask while moving from one subsection of text to the next concern understanding the main ideas in the previous section, and how they relate to those in the next. Questions students can ask after reading concern summarizing, listing main points, and ascertaining the material's significance. With reciprocal teaching, a student chosen randomly, following behavior modeled by the teacher, paraphrases or summarizes the content of the reading assignment and discusses difficulties in comprehension. The student then provides main idea sentences, and may predict test questions from the highlighted information. Inferences may be discussed relating the information to the students' lives and society, and personal experiences with the topic may be shared. (Information for student coding of major and supporting ideas in the text is included.) (HTH)

AN: EJ359113

AU: Duin, -Ann-Hill

TI: Implementing Cooperative Learning Groups in the Writing Curriculum.

PY: 1986

JN: Journal-of-Teaching-Writing; v5 n2 p315-23 Fall 1986

DE: Expository-Writing; Heuristics-; High-Schools; Small-Group-Instruction; Writing-Exercises

DE: *Group-Activities; *Group-Dynamics; *Learning-Activities; *Teaching-Methods; *Writing-Instruction; *Writing-Processes

AB: Noting that students in groups learn more effectively when working cooperatively than when working competitively or individualistically, presents guidelines, assignments, and class activities designed to foster cooperative learning. Describes such student-student interaction sessions as describing sense perception details, receiving peer feedback, and sharing prewriting to compose a multiauthor paper. (JG)

AN: ED297338

AU: Golub, -Jeff; And-Others

TI: Focus on Collaborative Learning. Classroom Practices in Teaching English, 1988.

CS: National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, Ill.

PY: 1988

AV: National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), 1111 Kenyon Rd., Urbana, IL 61801 (Stock No. 17538-015, \$7.50 member, \$9.95 nonmember).

NT: 162 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.

DE: Class-Activities; Class-Organization; Elementary-Secondary-Education; Group-Activities; Instructional-Innovation; Playwriting-;

Revision-Written-Composition

DE: *Cooperative-Learning; *English-Instruction;
 *Grouping-Instructional-Purposes; *Language-Arts;
 *Writing-Instruction

AB: Written by English teachers considered successful in directing collaborative learning, this collection of essays focuses on the effective use of collaborative learning in the English language arts classroom. The essays and their authors are, as follows: (1) "None of Us Is as Smart as All of Us" (Dana Herreman); (2) "Collaborative Learning and Other Disasters" (Richard Whitworth); (3) "Interactive Learning in the Composition Classroom" (Caryl Klein Sills); (4) "The Power of Collaboration" (Carol Gilles and Marc VanDover); (5) "Fine Cloth, Cut Carefully: Cooperative Learning in British Columbia" (Tom Morton); (6) "A Writing Teacher's Guide to Processing Small-Group Work" (E. Kathleen Booher); (7) "Cooperative Learning in the Literature Classroom" (Rex Easley); (8) "Group Library Research and Oral Reporting in Freshman Composition" (Barbara Schoen); (9) "Talking about Books: Readers Need Readers" (Adele Fiderer); (10) "Group Presentations of Poetry" (Muriel Ridland); (11) "Getting Out of the Writing Vacuum" (Margaret B. Fleming); (12) "Partners in the Writing Process" (Sharon E. Tsujimoto); (13) "Monitoring Individual Progress in Revision Groups" (Mary K. Simpson-Esper); (14) "Building Effective Student Writing Groups" (Jeffrey S. Copeland and Earl D. Lomax); (15) "The Group Paper" (Corrine Alonso); (16) "Ensuring the Success of Peer Revision Groups" (Edgar H. Thompson); (17) "Revising Response Groups" (Marie Foley); (18) "Project Write Start: Elementary and Secondary Writing Partners" (Kirsten Barfod Levinsohn and John Kendall); (19) "A Lesson in Rhetoric: Writing and Performing TV Commercials" (G. Douglas Meyers); (20) "The Sound of Music: A Harmonious Meeting of Minds" (Virginia McCormick); (21) "Six Sides to Learning" (S. Phyllis M. Taufen); (22) "Literature across the Curriculum: The 'Twenty-One Balloons' in the Sixth-Grade Classroom" (Donald R. Bear and Deborah Lohman); and (23) "Scriptwriting in Small Groups" (Carole Cox). (MM)

AN: EJ288970

AU: Hahn,-Amos-L.; Smith,-Terrie

TI: Students' Differentiation of Reader-Based and Text-Based Questions.

PY: 1983

JN: Journal-of-Educational-Research; v76 n6 p331-34 Jul-Aug 1983

AV: UMI

DE: Elementary-Education; Grade-3; Grade-5; Reading-Research

DE: *Metacognition-; *Peer-Teaching; *Reading-Ability;

*Reading-Comprehension; *Research-Methodology; *Tutoring-

AB: Significant differences were found in the ways that good and poor fifth-grade readers used text lookbacks, sampling, and other text behaviors while tutoring younger students. Researchers recommend the tutorial methodology for externalizing

metacognitive reading comprehension behavior and for research using error detection paradigms. (Author/PP)

AN: EJ368782
 AU: Harp, -Bill
 TI: When the Principal Asks: "Why Aren't You Using Peer Editing?"
 PY: 1988
 JN: Reading-Teacher; v41 n8 p828-30 Apr 1988
 AV: UMI
 NT: Special Issue: Poor Readers in the Classroom.
 DE: Editing-; Teaching-Methods; Writing-Composition
 DE: *Peer-Teaching; *Revision-Written-Composition;
 *Writing-Instruction
 AB: Outlines the process of peer editing, and points out that research shows peer editing to be highly effective. (ARH)

AN: EJ279850
 AU: Hoffman, -Steve
 TI: Outlining: A Group Task in the Reading Classroom.
 PY: 1983
 JN: Journal-of-Developmental-&-Remedial-Education; v6 n3 p20-21 Spr 1983
 AV: Reprint: UMI
 DE: Postsecondary-Education
 DE: *Group-Activities; *Reading-Comprehension;
 *Reading-Instruction; *Teaching-Methods
 AB: Describes an approach to teaching outlining skills, which stresses the dynamic interaction between reader and text. Recommends that the goal of improving student reading can be accomplished by a sequence of lessons in which students read and make personal outlines, and then move to group discussions to prepare composite outlines. (DMM)

AN: EJ373594
 AU: Jacobs, -George
 TI: Co-operative Goal Structure: A Way to Improve Group Activities.
 PY: 1988
 JN: ELT-Journal; v42 n2 p97-101 Apr 1988
 AV: UMI
 DE: Academic-Achievement; Classroom-Environment; Cooperation-; Course-Objectives; English-Second-Language; Feedback-; Foreign-Countries; Grading-; Teaching-Methods
 DE: *College-Students; *Group-Activities;
 *Second-Language-Instruction; *Student-Attitudes;
 *Writing-Instruction
 AB: Three principal types of goal structure are (1) cooperative; (2) competitive; and (3) individualistic. Specifically designed cooperatively structured group activities can improve group

performance and attitudes in class. A writing class for English majors is briefly described and evaluated before and after goal structure was considered. Grade averaging helped encourage cooperation. (Author/LMO)

AN: EJ322872

AU: Johnson,-Roger-T.; Johnson,-David-W.

TI: Student-Student Interaction: Ignored but Powerful.

PY: 1985

JN: Journal-of-Teacher-Education; v36 n4 p22-26 Jul-Aug 1985

AV: UMI

DE: Elementary-Secondary-Education; Higher-Education;

Peer-Influence; Preservice-Teacher-Education

DE: *Intergroup-Relations; *Learning-Strategies;

*Learning-Theories; *Peer-Teaching; *Teaching-Methods

AB: Although cooperative learning evidences the greatest potential for engendering student learning, it is used no more than 20 percent of the time in most classrooms. This article reviews research on cooperative, competitive, and individualistic structures used by teachers and discusses the implications for changing teacher preparation practices. (MT)

AN: EJ341892

AU: Johnson,-Roger-T.; Johnson,-David-W.

TI: Action Research: Cooperative Learning in the Science Classroom.

PY: 1986

JN: Science-and-Children; v24 n2 p31-32 Oct 1986

AV: UMI

DE: Cooperation-; Elementary-Education;

Elementary-School-Science; Evaluation-Methods; Group-Activities;

Group-Dynamics; Methods-Research; Peer-Relationship; Research-;

Science-Education; Theory-Practice-Relationship

DE: *Action-Research; *Group-Experience; *Peer-Teaching;

*Science-Teachers; *Teacher-Improvement; *Teamwork-

AB: Promotes the Every Teacher a Researcher program of the National Science Teachers Association. Encourages teachers to become involved in three types of action research with regard to cooperative learning in science. These are replicating, refining, and extending. Includes program registration form for interested teachers. (TW)

AN: EJ370074

AU: Judy,-Judith-E.; And-Others

TI: Effects of Two Instructional Approaches and Peer Tutoring on Gifted and Nongifted Sixth-Grade Students' Analogy Performance.

PY: 1988

JN: Reading-Research-Quarterly; v23 n2 p236-56 Spr 1988

AV: UMI

DE: Analysis-of-Covariance; Elementary-Education;
 Exceptional-Child-Research; Grade-6; Intermediate-Grades;
 Reading-Research; Tutoring-
 DE: *Academically-Gifted; *Peer-Teaching; *Reading-Instruction
 AB: Indicates that students who received direct instruction
 performed significantly better than students trained in inquiry
 on the analogy task and control subjects on the comprehension
 task. Gifted students consistently outperformed nongifted
 students on all measures, and tutored students performed
 comparably to students trained by the investigators. (JK)

AN: EJ303989
 AU: Kelly,-Patricia; And-Others
 TI: Composition through the Team Approach.
 PY: 1984
 JN: English-Journal; v73 n5 p71-74 Sep 1984
 AV: UMI
 DE: Peer-Evaluation; Secondary-Education;
 Small-Group-Instruction; Student-Attitudes; Teacher-Attitudes;
 Tutorial-Programs
 DE: *Peer-Teaching; *Teaching-Methods; *Team-Teaching;
 *Writing-Composition; *Writing-Instruction
 AB: Recounts a program that organized composition students into
 writing teams to overcome (1) too much reliance on a teacher, (2)
 lack of student cooperation, (3) excessive individual
 competition, and (4) an overall negative atmosphere concerning
 writing. (CRH)

AN: EJ293114
 AU: Lehr,-Fran
 TI: ERIC/RCS: Peer Teaching.
 PY: 1984
 JN: Reading-Teacher; v37 n7 p636-39 Mar 1984
 AV: UMI
 DE: Cross-Age-Teaching; Elementary-Education; Tutoring-
 DE: *Peer-Teaching; *Program-Development; *Program-Evaluation;
 *Program-Implementation; *Reading-Instruction; *Tutorial-Programs
 AB: Reviews ERIC materials dealing with effective tutoring
 programs. (FL)

AN: ED283193
 AU: McEachern,-William-Ross
 TI: Group Compositions: A Model for Report Writing.
 PY: 1986
 NT: 16 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National
 Council of Teachers of English (76th, San Antonio, TX, November
 21-26, 1986). Students' writing samples in figures 1 and 2 may
 not reproduce well.
 PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Intermediate-Grades; Prewriting-; Research-Papers-Students; Writing-Composition; Writing-Improvement
 DE: *Cooperation-; *Revision-Written-Composition; *Teaching-Methods; *Writing-Instruction; *Writing-Processes
 AB: Elementary school students are unfamiliar with the process of writing a report on an assigned topic. One strategy for rectifying this is to have students compose reports in groups. Group compositions are a collaborative effort to prepare a piece of writing whereby students in either large or small groups work through the writing process together and produce a single product. The teacher might choose the topic and direct the prewriting stage in order to help students through the first draft. While the instructor takes notes on the blackboard, students discuss the topic. Students then dictate sentences to the teacher, who copies exactly what has been dictated on a piece of chart paper so that the students can see the structure of their report taking shape. This first draft is open to change and improvement. Revision is especially difficult for students, and the group situation helps them through the process, since the burden of making improvements is not an individual one. The teacher may have to provide direct guidance at this stage. It is best if students concentrate on only one or two areas of concern at a time to avoid confusion. Proofreading is the final stage of the process. The real gauge of the success of group report writing is the first individual writing assignment during which the teacher may observe students employing revision, and note improved quality in their compositions. (Students' writing samples are included.) (AEW)

AN: EJ350582
 AU: Montague, -Marjorie; Tanner, -Michael-L.
 TI: Reading Strategy Groups for Content Area Instruction.
 PY: 1987
 JN: Journal-of-Reading; v30 n8 p716-23 May 1987
 AV: UMI
 DE: Learning-Strategies; Secondary-Education; Teaching-Methods
 DE: *Cooperation-; *Group-Activities; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Reading-Strategies
 AB: Reviews relevant research in reading comprehension strategies and cooperative learning methods. Describes reading strategy groups as an approach for content area instruction, along with practical suggestions for implementation. (JD)

AN: EJ370500
 AU: Parrott, -Jeremy
 TI: Reading Syndicates: A Working Model for the Language Classroom.
 PY: 1987
 JN: Reading-in-a-Foreign-Language; v3 n2 p411-16 Spr 1987
 DE: Group-Dynamics; Individualized-Instruction; Reading-Interests

DE: *Literature-Appreciation; *Models-; *Peer-Teaching;
 *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Strategies;
 *Second-Language-Instruction

AB: Proposes a classroom model for developing an interest in reading for pleasure and increasing literary competence among intermediate or advanced second-language students. The model employs a reading syndicate web through which students read collectively literary texts and share their individually acquired knowledge and appreciation to enhance the overall group level of literary awareness. (Author/CB)

AN: EJ372701

AU: Pickens,-Judith; McNaughton,-Stuart

TI: Peer Tutoring of Comprehension Strategies.

PY: 1988

JN: Educational-Psychology:-An-International-Journal-of-Experiment
 al-Educational-Psychology; v8 n1-2 p67-80 Mar-Jun 1988

DE: Elementary-Education; Foreign-Countries; Reading-Research

DE: *Instructional-Development; *Peer-Teaching;

*Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Instruction;

*Reading-Strategies; *Tutoring-

AB: Discusses a study in which four low-achieving 12-year-old readers were trained to tutor similar age low-achieving readers in reading comprehension strategies. States that both tutors and students learned to use the strategies effectively and that both groups made substantial gains in comprehension. (GEA)

AN: EJ362346

AU: Polirstok,-Susan-Rovet; Greer,-R.-Douglas

TI: A Replication of Collateral Effects and a Component Analysis of a Successful Tutoring Package for Inner-City Adolescents.

PY: 1986

JN: Education-and-Treatment-of-Children; v9 n2 p101-21 May 1986

DE: Academic-Achievement; Adolescents-; Peer-Relationship;

Secondary-Education; Student-Behavior; Tutoring-;

Underachievement-; Urban-Education

DE: *Inner-City; *Low-Achievement; *Peer-Teaching;

*Reading-Difficulties; *Tutorial-Programs

AB: Results of analyzing variables impacting the behavior of four ninth-grade poor-achieving tutors and 20 seventh-grade tutees with reading difficulties found that giving tutor points for reinforcing tutee responses was the most important component of the tutoring package for both tutors and tutees. (Author/JDD)

AN: ED230905

AU: Rupley,-William-H.; And-Others

TI: Effective Classroom Management in Reading Instruction.

PY: 1983

NT: 10 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Texas

State Council of the International Reading Association (11th, Houston, TX, March 10-12, 1983).

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Classroom-Environment; Discipline-; Elementary-Education; Elementary-School-Teachers

DE: *Class-Organization; *Classroom-Techniques;

*Reading-Instruction; *Teacher-Effectiveness; *Teacher-Role

AB: In light of the importance of a teacher's managerial ability and the use of small and large group instruction to increase direct instruction time, teachers should apply specific managerial skills in their reading classes to ensure student learning. Successful teachers get to know their students, set instructional goals, and make sure students know what is expected of them. Preparing reading materials in advance and distributing them before class begins will minimize disruptions. The use of individual student activity folders will also minimize disruptive transitions and can aid in keeping students on task. Students should be taught to use a help sign when they have a problem with seat work, which can cut down on the amount of time wasted when a problem arises and reduce student interruption of a lesson when the teacher is busy elsewhere in the room. By positioning students so that they can be seen by the teacher at all times from anywhere in the room, teachers can more easily monitor student engagement in learning activities. Task-related comments, which specify what the students should be doing at the moment, serve to refocus students' attention to the assigned task without embarrassing them. The best way to minimize disruptive behavior is to note when a student misbehaves, whether there is a pattern to the behavior, and how much it affects other students. Such reflections can help teachers understand the problem and take steps to correct it. (HTH)

AN: ED273110

AU: Scott,-Wendy; Millar,-Ninian

TI: Using Your Textbook Communicatively.

PY: 1984

NT: 8 p.; In: Willems, Gerard, Ed., Communicative Foreign Language Teaching and the Training of Foreign Language Teachers, 1984. p164-171. See FL 015 917.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Classroom-Techniques; Communicative-Competence-Languages; Educational-Strategies; Elementary-Secondary-Education; Listening-Comprehension; Textbooks-

DE: *Advance-Organizers; *Class-Activities;

*Directed-Reading-Activity; *Group-Activities;

*Reading-Comprehension; *Second-Language-Instruction

AB: Teachers who do not use specifically communicatively-oriented textbooks can still derive much useful communicative language work from them. A key to success is engaging the student in the reading and comprehension of the text. Class exercises that can be used as pre-reading or pre-listening activities include: (1)

giving students key words or allowing them to hear very brief excerpts and asking them to guess the story, individually or in groups; (2) letting students read or listen to different parts of the story, or see pictures of the story, and together work out the entire story; (3) ordering story pictures incorrectly and having students reorder them; and (4) having some students view story pictures and describe them to the others. Reading the text, which should be done silently, can be accompanied by the students' asking comprehension questions of each other or of the teacher. Communicative activities to follow reading include: having students write down their interpretations of the story and comparing them; having students act out the story; and having students relate some aspect of the story to their lives in a variety of exercises. (MSE)

AN: ED260023

AU: Slavin, -Robert-E.

TI: Student Team Learning.

CS: Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md. Center for Social Organization of Schools.

PY: [1980]

NT: 25 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Elementary-Secondary-Education; Peer-Relationship; Self-Concept

DE: *Academic-Achievement; *Group-Dynamics; *Learning-Strategies; *Peer-Teaching; *Teamwork-

AB: Three Student Team Learning techniques have been extensively researched and found to significantly increase student learning. In Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD), teams are made up of high, average, and low performing students of both genders and different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Team members study worksheets, work problems in pairs, take turns quizzing each other, or discuss problems as a group, using any means they wish to master the material. Teams-Games-Tournaments (TGT) uses teams and format similar to STAD; however, students play academic games to show their individual mastery of the subject matter in weekly tournaments. In Jigsaw, academic material is broken down into sections, teams of two master the sections and in turn instruct other team-mates in their areas of "expertise." A case study is presented of a student experiencing the three Student Team Learning techniques. Research evidence is presented on the effectiveness of Student Team Learning in academic achievement and its usefulness in integrating biracial and mainstreamed classrooms. (JD)

AN: EJ361646

AU: Slavin, -Robert-E.

TI: Cooperative Learning and Individualized Instruction.

PY: 1987

JN: Arithmetic-Teacher; v35 n3 p14-16 Nov 1987

AV: UMI

DE: Elementary-Education

DE: *Elementary-School-Mathematics; *Group-Activities;

*Individual-Instruction; *Mathematics-Instruction;

*Peer-Teaching; *Program-Descriptions

AB: Described is a teaching approach that applies principles of cooperative learning to an individualized program for learning mathematics in grades 3-6. The program, Team Assisted Individualization, has several important elements including student teams, a placement test, curriculum materials, the team-study method, team scores and team recognition, teaching groups, facts tests, and whole-class units. (RH)

AN: ED223046

AU: Slavin,-Robert-E.; And-Others

TI: Effects of Cooperative Learning and Individualized Instruction on the Social Acceptance, Achievement, and Behavior of Mainstreamed Students. Report No. 327.

CS: Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md. Center for Social Organization of Schools.

PY: 1982

NT: 30 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DE: Elementary-Education; Individualized-Instruction; Mathematics-Instruction; Teacher-Attitudes

DE: *Cooperation-; *Learning-Disabilities; *Mainstreaming-; *Peer-Acceptance; *Peer-Teaching; *Teamwork-

AB: The study, involving 119 academically handicapped third, fourth, and fifth graders, examined the effects of an instructional method (Team-Assisted Individualization) that combines cooperative learning with individualized learning in mathematics. Previous studies have found that the use of cooperative learning instructional processes can improve relations between normal-progress students and mainstreamed handicapped students; however, these processes incorporate class-paced instruction, which is generally not appropriate for handicapped students. Principal components of the Team-Assisted Individualization Program (TAI) were four- or five-member teams each with high, average, and low achievers; presentation of a diagnostic test at the beginning of the project on mathematics operations; individualized curriculum materials covering addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, numeration, decimals, fractions, and word problems; the team study method; team scores and team recognition; and teacher review sessions. A materials-only (MO) group used the same curriculum materials and procedures as the TAI group except the students worked individually and did not receive team scores or certificates. The control group used traditional methods for teaching mathematics. Ss were evaluated on sociometric measures, mathematics achievement, attitudes, and behavior ratings. Results confirmed

the hypothesis that the cooperative individualized program for mathematics instruction (TAI) would increase the sociometric status of mainstreamed academically handicapped students. However, it appeared that the use of cooperation per se may not have been the critical component of the program, because the mainstreamed students in the groups using individualized curriculum materials only also improved significantly in sociometric status. (SW)

AN: EJ367435

AU: Slavin, -Robert-E.; And-Others

TI: Accommodating Student Diversity in Reading and Writing Instruction: A Cooperative Learning Approach.

PY: 1988

JN: Remedial-and-Special-Education-(RASE); v9 n1 p60-66 Jan-Feb 1988

AV: UMI

DE: English-Instruction; Intermediate-Grades; Language-Arts; Mainstreaming-; Peer-Teaching; Reading-Instruction; Teaching-Methods; Writing-Instruction

DE: *Cooperation-; *Heterogeneous-Grouping;

*Homogeneous-Grouping; *Integrated-Activities;

*Reading-Difficulties; *Remedial-Reading

AB: "Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition" is a program that successfully teaches reading, writing, and language arts in heterogeneous intermediate classes containing mainstreamed special education and remedial reading students, by combining mixed-ability cooperative learning teams and same-ability reading groups. (Author/JDD)

AN: EJ358543

AU: Topping, -Keith

TI: Peer Tutored Paired Reading: Outcome Data from Ten Projects.

PY: 1987

JN: Educational-Psychology; v7 n2 p133-45 1987

DE: Elementary-Education

DE: *Peer-Teaching; *Reading-Achievement; *Reading-Instruction; *Tutoring-

AB: Reviews the procedures and outcomes of ten different peer tutoring projects. The evidence reviewed suggests that peer tutored paired reading accelerates children's reading progress, with peer tutors gaining more than the children who receive tutoring. (Author/JDH)

AN: EJ279335

AU: Yamada, -Yoko

TI: How Much Can Children Learn from a Single Book?

PY: 1983

JN: Reading-Teacher; v36 n9 p880-83 May 1983

AV: Reprint: UMI

DE: Cognitive-Processes; Fiction-; Foreign-Countries;
Intermediate-Grades; Reading-Skills; Study-Skills

DE: *Directed-Reading-Activity; *Group-Activities;
*Learning-Processes; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Materials

AB: Describes the directed group reading technique used by a middle grades teacher in Japan to help her students get the most from a book. Explains how the technique not only allowed the students to acquire more knowledge, but also taught them how to study and think. (FL)

GETTING COPIES OF THE ITEMS DESCRIBED IN THE ERIC DATABASE:

The items described in the ERIC database have either an "ED" or an "EJ" number in the first field. About 98% of the ED items can be found in the ERIC Microfiche Collection. The ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) in Alexandria, Virginia can produce either microfiche or paper copies of these documents for you. Check the accompanying list of ERIC Price Codes for their current prices.

Alternatively, you may prefer to consult the ERIC Microfiche Collection yourself before choosing documents to copy. Over 600 libraries in the United States subscribe to this collection. To find out which libraries near you have it, you are welcome to call the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills at (812) 855-5847. Most such libraries have equipment on site for inexpensive production of paper copies from the fiche.

For those few ED-numbered items not found in the Microfiche Collection, check the availability (AV) field of the citation to get information about the author, publisher, or other distributor.

Items with an EJ number in the first field of the citation are journal articles. Due to copyright restrictions, ERIC cannot provide copies of these articles. Most large college or university libraries subscribe to the journals in which these articles were published, and the general public can read or copy the articles from their collections. Should you want copies of articles which appeared in journals not owned by your nearest university library, arrangements usually can be made via interlibrary loan; there frequently is a nominal charge for this, which is set by the lending library. If you are a faculty member, staff member, or student at the university, just ask at your library's reference desk.

For all other categories of users, most universities cannot provide interlibrary services. However, public libraries---which are there to serve all area residents---typically are hooked into statewide lending networks designed to ensure that all state residents have access to materials of interest. Ask your local public librarian about interlibrary loan policies, charges, etc.

There are also two professional reprint services which have obtained permission from some journals to sell article copies. These are University Microfilms International (Article Clearinghouse, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106---(800) 732-0616), and the Institute for Scientific Information (Original Article Tear Sheet Service, 3501 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104---(800) 523-1850). At the time of this publication, UMI charged \$10.75 per article regardless of length, and ISI charged \$9.50 for the first ten pages, plus \$2.00 for each additional ten pages or fraction thereof. However, please check with them for current prices before ordering.

ERIC Price Codes

PAPER COPY /HARD COPY

PRICE CODE	PAGINATION	PRICE
PC 01	1- 25	\$ 2.03
PC 02	26- 50	4.06
PC 03	51- 75	6.09
PC 04	76- 100	8.12
PC 05	101- 125	10.15
PC 06	126- 150	12.18
PC 07	151- 175	14.21
PC 08	176- 200	16.24
PC 09	201- 225	18.27
PC 10	226- 250	20.30
PC 11	251- 275	22.33
PC 12	276- 300	24.36
PC 13	301- 325	26.39
PC 14	326- 350	28.42
PC 15	351- 375	30.45
PC 16	376- 400	32.48
PC 17	401- 425	34.51
PC 18	426- 450	36.54
PC 19	451- 475	38.57
PC 20	476- 500	40.60
PC 21	501- 525	42.63
PC 22	526- 550	44.66
PC 23	551- 575	46.69
PC 24	576- 600	48.72
PC 25	601- 625	50.75
PC 26	626- 650	52.78
PC 27	651- 675	54.81
PC 28	676- 700	56.84
PC 29	701- 725	58.87
PC 30	726- 750	60.90
PC 31	751- 775	62.93
PC 32	776- 800	64.96
PC 33	801- 825	66.99
PC 34	826- 850	69.02
PC 35	851- 875	71.05
PC 36	876- 900	73.08
PC 37	901- 925	75.11
PC 38	926- 950	77.14
PC 39	951- 975	79.17
PC 40	976-1,000	81.20

ADD 2.03 FOR EACH ADDITIONAL 25 PAGES,
OR FRACTION THEREOF

MICROFICHE

PRICE CODE	PAGINATION	NO. OF FICHE	PRICE
MF 01	1- 480	1-5	\$.86
MF 02	481- 576	6	1.03
MF 03	577- 672	7	1.20
MF 04	673- 768	8	1.37
MF 05	769- 864	9	1.54
MF 06	865- 960	10	1.71
MF 07	961-1,056	11	1.88
MF 08	1,057-1,152	12	2.05
MF 09	1,153-1,248	13	2.22
MF 10	1,249-1,344	14	2.39
MF 11	1,345-1,440	15	2.56
MF 12	1,441-1,536	16	2.73
MF 13	1,537-1,632	17	2.90
MF 14	1,633-1,728	18	3.07
MF 15	1,729-1,824	19	3.24

ADD \$0.17 FOR EACH ADDITIONAL MICROFICHE
(1-96 PAGES)

HOW TO ORDER ERIC DOCUMENTS
EDRS **ERIC**[®] **DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE**
 7420 FULLERTON ROAD, SUITE 110
 SPRINGFIELD, VA 22153-2852
 OPERATED BY
 CINCINNATI BELL INFORMATION SYSTEMS (CBIS) FEDERAL
 800-443-3742 703-440-1400

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS TO COMPLETE THIS ORDER FORM

- Order by 6 digit ED number
- Enter unit price
- Specify either Microfiche (MF) or Paper Copy (PC)
- Include shipping charges

ED NUMBER	NO. OF PAGES	NO. OF COPIES		UNIT PRICE	TOTAL UNIT COST
		MF	PC		
TOTAL NO. OF PAGES				SUBTOTAL	

UNIT PRICE SCHEDULE

MICROFICHE (MF)			PAPER COPY (PC)			RESIDENTS OF VA, MD AND DC - ADD APPLICABLE SALES TAX
NUMBER FICHE EACH ED #	PRICE CODE	Price	NUMBER PAGES EACH ED #	PRICE CODE	Price	
1 to 5 (up to 480 pages) Each additional microfiche (additional 96 pages)	MF01	\$1.15	1 to 25 Each additional 25 pages	PC01	\$3.12	SHIPPING CHARGES
		\$.25				TOTAL COST

CHARTS FOR DETERMINING SHIPPING CHARGES

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE		1st CLASS POSTAGE FOR			MICROFICHE ONLY	
1-7	8-19	20-30	31-42	43-54	55-67	68-80
Microfiche ONLY	Microfiche ONLY	Microfiche ONLY	Microfiche ONLY	Microfiche ONLY	Microfiche ONLY	Microfiche ONLY
\$0.29	\$0.52	\$0.75	\$0.98	\$1.21	\$1.44	\$1.67

UNITED PARCEL SERVICE CHARGES FOR CONTINENTAL U.S. SHIPMENTS ONLY*

*UPS will not deliver to a P.O. Box Number. A Street Address must be provided.

1 lb. 81-160 MF or 1-75 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$2.79	2 lbs. 161-330 MF or 76-150 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$3.30	3 lbs. 331-500 MF or 151-225 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$3.74	4 lbs. 501-670 MF or 226-300 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$4.09	5 lbs. 671-840 MF or 301-375 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$4.31	6 lbs. 841-1010 MF or 376-450 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$4.53	7 lbs. 1011-1180 MF or 451-525 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$4.77	8 to 10 lbs. 1181-1690 MF 526-750 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$5.17-\$5.94
--	--	---	---	---	--	---	---

NOTE—Orders for 81 or more microfiche and all orders for paper copies (PC) will be shipped via United Parcel Service unless otherwise instructed.

SEE REVERSE FOR EXPEDITED DOCUMENT DELIVERY SERVICE

PAYMENTS: You may pay by

1. Enclosing CHECK or MONEY ORDER with your order. Foreign customer checks must be drawn on a U.S. bank.
2. Charge to a MasterCard or VISA account. Enter account number, card expiration date and signature. (EDRS also accepts telephone orders when charged to a MasterCard or VISA account.)
3. PURCHASE ORDERS: U.S. customers may enclose an authorized original purchase order. No purchase orders are accepted from foreign customers.
4. Charge to a DEPOSIT ACCOUNT. Enter deposit account number and sign order form.

PLEASE INDICATE METHOD OF PAYMENT AND ENTER REQUIRED INFORMATION.



WE HONOR
BOTH



- ☐ Check or Money Order ☐ Purchase Order (ATTACH ORIGINAL PURCHASE ORDER)
- ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account Number _____ Expiration Date _____

Signature _____

☐ Deposit Account Number _____

Signature _____

ENTER "SHIP TO" ADDRESS _____

CALL TOLL FREE 1-800-443-ERIC (3742) 24 HOURS A DAY - 7 DAYS A WEEK
 ALLOW 5 WORKING DAYS FOR EDRS TO PROCESS AND SHIP YOUR ORDER

EXPEDITED DOCUMENT DELIVERY

Expedited delivery of ERIC documents is available.

- Call in your order 24 hours a day toll free 1-800-443-ERIC (3742).
- Fax your order 24 hours a day 703-440-1408.

Your order will be shipped to you, by the method you select, on the fifth (5th) working day after receipt.

To insure expedited receipt, request shipment by either:

- USPS Express Mail
- Federal Express
- UPS Next Day Air
- FAX transmission of your document

Shipping and FAX transmission charges will be added to the cost of the document(s) by EDRS.

These requesting and delivery methods are in addition to the 3-day delivery services available in response to orders received through the use of on-line data base services.

STANDING ORDERS SUBSCRIPTION ACCOUNTS

Subscription orders for documents in the monthly issue of *Resources in Education* (RIE) are available on microfiche from EDRS. The microfiche are furnished on a diazo film base and without envelopes at \$0.111 per microfiche. If you prefer a silver halide film base, the cost is \$0.225 per microfiche and each microfiche is inserted into a protective envelope. SHIPPING CHARGES ARE EXTRA. A Standing Order Account may be opened by depositing \$1,500.00 or submitting an executed purchase order. The cost of each issue and shipping will be charged against the account. A monthly statement of the account will be furnished.

BACK COLLECTIONS

Back collections of documents in all issues of *Resources in Education* (RIE) since 1966 are available on microfiche at a unit price of \$0.131 per microfiche. The collections from 1966 through 1985 are furnished on a vesicular film base and without envelopes. Since 1986, collections are furnished on a diazo film base without envelopes. SHIPPING CHARGES ARE EXTRA. For pricing information, write or call toll free 1-800-443-ERIC (3742).

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. PRICE LIST

The prices set forth herein may be changed without notice; however, any price change is subject to the approval of the Contracting Officer/USED/Office of Educational Research and Improvement/Contracts and Grants Management Division.

2. PAYMENT

The prices set forth herein do not include any sales, use, excise, or similar taxes that may apply to the sale of microfiche or paper copy to the Customer. The cost of such taxes, if any, shall be borne by the Customer.

Payment shall be made net thirty (30) days from date of invoice. Payment shall be without expense to CBIS Federal.

3. REPRODUCTION

Express permission to reproduce a copyrighted document provided hereunder must be obtained from the copyright holder noted on the title page of such copyrighted document.

4. CONTINGENCIES

CBIS Federal shall not be liable to Customer or any other person for any failure or delay in the performance of any obligation if such failure or delay (a) is due to events beyond the control of CBIS Federal including, but not limited to, fire, storm, flood, earthquake, explosion, accident, acts of the public enemy, strikes, lockouts, labor disputes, labor shortages, work stoppages, transportation embargoes or delays, failure or shortage of materials, supplies or machinery, acts of God, or acts or regulations or priorities of the federal, state, or local governments; (b) is due to failures of performances of subcontractors beyond CBIS Federal's control and without negligence on the part of CBIS Federal; or (c) is due to erroneous or incomplete information furnished by Customer.

5. LIABILITY

CBIS Federal's liability, if any, arising hereunder shall not exceed restitution of charges.

In no event shall CBIS Federal be liable for special, consequential, or liquidated damages arising from the provision of services hereunder.

6. WARRANTY

CBIS FEDERAL MAKES NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO ANY MATTER WHATSOEVER, INCLUDING ANY WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

7. QUALITY

CBIS Federal will replace products returned because of reproduction defects or incompleteness. The quality of the input document is not the responsibility of CBIS Federal. Best available copy will be supplied.

8. CHANGES

No waiver, alteration, or modification of any of the provisions hereof shall be binding unless in writing and signed by an officer of CBIS Federal.

9. DEFAULT AND WAIVER

- If customer fails with respect to this or any other agreement with CBIS Federal to pay any invoice when due or to accept any shipment as ordered, CBIS Federal may, without prejudice to other remedies, defer any further shipments until the default is corrected, or may cancel the order.
- No course of conduct nor any delay of CBIS Federal in exercising any right hereunder shall waive any rights of CBIS Federal or modify this Agreement.

10. GOVERNING LAW

This Agreement shall be construed to be between merchants. Any questions concerning its validity, construction, or performance shall be governed by the laws of the State of Virginia.

11. DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS

Customers who have a continuing need for ERIC documents may open a Deposit Account by depositing a minimum of \$300.00. Once a Deposit Account is opened, ERIC documents will be sent upon request, and the account charged for the actual cost and postage. A monthly statement of the account will be furnished.

12. PAPER COPY (PC)

A paper copy (PC) is a xerographic reproduction, on paper, of the original document. Each paper copy has a Vellum Bristol cover to identify and protect the document.

13. FOREIGN POSTAGE

Postage for all countries other than the United States is based on the International Postage Rates in effect at the time the order is shipped. To determine postage, allow 160 microfiche or 75 (PC) pages per pound. Customers must specify the exact classification of mail desired, and include the postage for that classification with their order. Payment must be in United States funds.